

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 STEVEN CITY BROOMFIELD,

4 Plaintiff

Case No. 3:18-cv-00184-MMD-WGC

ORDER

5 v.

6 ROMEO ARANAS et al.,

7 Defendants
8

9 **I. DISCUSSION**

10 The Court denies Plaintiff's motion for return copies of e-file attachments (ECF No.
11 4). The Court cannot provide copies or mailing service for parties, even indigent plaintiffs
12 proceeding *in forma pauperis*. If Plaintiff wishes to receive copies of electronically filed
13 documents from the Court, the cost is \$0.10 per page. Nev. LR IC 1-1(i)(5).

14 Plaintiff has filed a motion to extend his copy work limit. (ECF No. 5). An inmate
15 has no constitutional right to free photocopying. *Johnson v. Moore*, 948 F.2d 517, 521
16 (9th Cir. 1991). Pursuant to NDOC administrative regulation 722.01(7)(D), inmates "can
17 only accrue a maximum of \$100 debt for copy work expenses for all cases, not per case."
18 In this district, courts have found that they can order a prison to provide limited
19 photocopying when it is necessary for an inmate to provide copies to the court and other
20 parties. See *Allen v. Clark Cnty. Det. Ctr.*, 2:10-CV-00857-RLH, 2011 WL 886343, *2 (D.
21 Nev. Mar. 11, 2011). In this case, the Court denies Plaintiff's motion at this time. Plaintiff
22 may renew this motion if Plaintiff's complaint survives screening.

23 Moreover, the Court notes that Plaintiff's case is in line for screening and that the
24 Court will issue a screening order in due course.

25 **II. CONCLUSION**

26 For the foregoing reasons, it is ordered that the motion for return copies (ECF No.
27 4) is denied.

28 It is further ordered that the motion to extend prison copy work limit (ECF No. 5) is

1 denied.

2
3 DATED: January 22, 2019.

4 *William G. Cobb*

5 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28